



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,322	12/15/2005	Per Mansson	MANS3010/REF	3648
23364	7590	08/07/2009	EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176				YU, MELANIE J
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1641				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/517,322	MANSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MELANIE YU	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 12-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura et al. (US 2002/0009812) in view of Jacobs et al. (US 6,905,816) further in view of Johnson (US 5,631,172).

Miura et al. teach a coated metal surface on a solid support (thin metal film formed on a prism support, par. 6); the coating consisting of a protein layer firmly attached to the metal surface (BSA, par. 22 and 43) and the protein layer coupled to linker molecules that are bound to low molecular weight antigens (par. 22 and 50; antigens are low molecular weight, par. 41), wherein the linker molecules are coupled to the protein layer and are bound to the antigen (par. 105-110), and wherein the antigens are reversibly bound to antibodies specific for the antigens wherein the antibodies are more weakly bound to the immobilized antigens than an analyte antigen to be tested for

Art Unit: 1641

displacement of the antibody from the immobilized antigen (antibodies are bound to antigens on substrate, and are reversibly bound because the antibodies can be displaced during a competition assay and therefore the antibodies are more weakly bound than an analyte because the antibodies can be displaced by the analyte, par. 81).

Miura differs from instant claims in failing to teach the linker specifically having functional end groups attached to the protein and the antigen and the linker between the functional end groups having an aliphatic hydrocarbon chain of 1, 2 or 3 carbon atoms.

Jacobs teaches a protein layer on a substrate surface (BSA coating, col. 16, lines 26-40 and 53-67) linker having functional end groups (NHS-Y-NHS connects amine surface with amine-group containing molecule, col. 17, lines 5-15, Jacobs et al. does not specify what the connecting linker Y is; col. 17, line 47-col. 18, line 7), in order to provide an easy and low cost alternative to providing a number of tests.

And, Johnson teaches a bifunctional linker (spacer arm is bifunctional linker p-Q-r or a-B-c, col. 13, lines 15-22), wherein each bifunctional linker has a linking moiety between the functional end groups wherein the linking moieties have between 0 and 50 carbon atoms, which encompasses the recited range of 1, 2 or 3 carbon atoms (Q and B are linking moieties between the functional end groups, col. 13, lines 32-35) and the linking moiety is alkylene, which is an aliphatic hydrocarbon chain having 2 carbon atoms (Q and B are the linking moieties and may be alkylene, col. 13, lines 42-44), in order to provide a spacer arm for labeling purposes.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include as the linker on the solid support of Miura et al., a bifunctional linker having two functional end groups as taught by Jacobs et al., in order to easily attach an antigen to a substrate having a protein by converting the chemical reactivity of the substrate surface. It would have further been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include as the linking moiety between functional end groups of the bifunctional linker of Miura et al. in view of Jacobs et al., an alkylene which is an aliphatic hydrocarbon chain having 2 carbon atoms as taught by Johnson, because Jacobs et al. does not teach the specific type of linking moiety present between the two functional end groups of a bifunctional linker and is therefore generic with respect to the type of linking moiety that can be incorporated into the bifunctional linker and one would be motivated to use an appropriate linking moiety between functional end groups.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success when combining Johnson with Miura et al. in view of Jacobs et al. because Jacobs et al. teach a bifunctional linker having end units of aldehydes, carboxylic acids and amine (col. 17, line 47-col. 18, line 7), which are the same bifunctional end groups taught by Johnson (aldehyde, carboxy, NH₂; col. 17, lines 42-49). Therefore one having ordinary skill would recognize that the linking moiety (alkylene) taught by Johnson is compatible with and can be used to link the two functional end groups of Jacobs et al. to form a linker molecule.

Regarding claims 2 and 18, Miura et al. teach the metal selected from gold, silver, aluminum and nickel (par. 48).

With respect to claims 3, 5 and 15, Miura et al. teach the same antigens bound to the same protein layer (Fig. 13; par. 79 and 80) and the antigen being a narcotic that is cocaine or methamphetamine (par. 41).

Regarding claims 17 and 18, Miura et al. teach the antibody being a monoclonal antibody (BSA is a monoclonal antibody, par. 81) and do not specifically teach how the antibody is produced or the affinity to the antigen. However, it has long been settled to be no more than routine experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to discover an optimum value for a result effective variable. “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum of workable ranges by routine experimentation” Application of Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235-236 (C.C.P.A. 1955). “No invention is involved in discovering optimum ranges of a process by routine experimentation.” Id. at 458, 105 USPQ at 236-237. The “discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill of the art.” Since applicant has not disclosed that the specific limitations recited in instant claim 18 is for any particular purpose or solve any stated problem, and the prior art teaches that the affinity of an antibody for an antigen may be varied depending on the desired affinity required for displacement. Absent unexpected results, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to discover the optimum workable ranges of the methods disclosed by the prior art by normal optimization procedures know in the displacement assay art. Although Miura et

al. do not teach the specific method of production of the monoclonal antibodies, such a limitation is drawn to a method of making and only the final product must read on the instant claims. The device taught by Miura et al. in view of Jacobs et al. further in view of Tao et al. teach the required product limitations and a monoclonal antibody and therefore reads on the instant claims.

2. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura et al. (US 2002/0009812) in view of Jacobs et al. (US 6,905,816) further in view of Johnson (US 5,631,172), as applied to claims 1 and 12, further in view of Houser et al. (US 2003/0162987).

Miura et al. in view of Jacobs et al. further in view of Tao et al. teach a coated metal surface having a protein layer and an antigen that is a narcotic, but fail to teach the antigen being an explosive.

Houser et al. teach a surface plasmon resonance assay wherein a quartz slide is coated with metal (par. 50) and a sensing film is coated on the metal coated glass slide (par. 16), wherein TNT is the detected antigen (par. 14), in order to provide accurate detection of an explosive in a sample.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include as an antigen in the device of Miura et al. in view of Jacobs et al. further in view of Johnson, an antigen that is TNT as taught by Houser et al., in order to provide detection of a toxic explosive in a sample (par. 14).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 12-18 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous rejections of the claims have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Johnson teaching an aliphatic hydrocarbon chain having 2 carbon atoms used as a linking moiety between two functional end groups of a bifunctional linker. Johnson is relied upon only for the type of linking moiety that is used between two functional end groups and not the type of substrate, type of functional end groups, or the use and placement of the bifunctional linker.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELANIE YU whose telephone number is (571)272-2933. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Shibuya can be reached on (571) 272-0806. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1641

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melanie Yu/
Examiner, Art Unit 1641